

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Amendments to the Claims

Enclosed is a Substitute Specification listing the amended claims.

1 & 2 Elections/Rejections

Applicant hereby elects species 2 (Figures 4-6). Applicant asserts Claims 1, 2 and 3 are generic to all species. Claims 1-8 and Claim 11 added (as described in Specification and Figure 6) are readable on Species 2 and the generic claims.

3. Specification

New application papers for the Specification and Abstract with lines double-spaced on good quality paper are enclosed. Minor error corrections as noted in C above, and a reworded description of "rearward hosel extension" addressing Examiner's confusion over same are included in the amended Specification without addition of any new material.

4. Claim Objections

Amended Claims, double-spaced on good quality paper are included.

5. Information Disclosure Statement

An Information Disclosure Statement is enclosed as a separate paper distinct from Specification.

6. Drawings

Applicant believes revised description of "rearward hosel extension" in the Specification and the amended Claims with the following Remarks regarding same will clarify confusion over this term and show that the existing Drawings show every feature of the invention specified in the Claims. No new matter is added.

The "rearward hosel extension" of the present invention is not part of the "hosel" or "neck", which most golf equipment art and the United States Golf Association (USGA) considers to be the connection means between the straight portion of the putter shaft and the putterhead body.

The shaft connection hosel or neck of the present invention does not extend rearward of the front portion of the putterhead. The "rearward hosel extension" (7 in

Figs. 4, 5 and 6) does not function as a hosel, but rather visually extends the top surface 16 and sight line 20 of the forward hosel section 12, again in Figs. 4, 5 and 6. In addition, this non-hosel "rearward hosel extension" can have other functions such as providing or supporting the putterhead sole (18 in Fig. 6), or rigidizing the central portion of the strikeface (15 in Figs. 4, 5 and 6), or rigidly connecting rearward weights (25 in Fig. 7) with the central portion of the strikeface.

7 & 8 Claim 1-8 Rejections - 35 USC 112; indefinite

Applicant feels the amended Claims remove the "indefinite" objections noted and thanks Examiner for assisting this Pro Se Applicant in improving Claim wording. The indefinite term "hosel extensions" is removed throughout, including Claims 1, 4 and 5 and replaced by "hosel extending generally horizontally forward" and "rearward hosel extension" which as previously stated, does not function as a shaft to putterhead connecting means or "hosel" or "neck."

Claim 1 is further improved via removal of "may", making said "rearward hosel extension" which is not a part of any cited prior art, a required element of Claim 1.

Claim 8 is amended by changing "said rearward sight line extension" to "said rearward hosel extension" of Claim 1.

9 & 10 Claim 1 and 2 Rejections - 35 USC 103; Gebhardt in view of Szokola

Gebhardt D313057 shows a rearward extending hosel (Figs. 1-7) unlike the present invention, and an alternative forward extending hosel (Figs. 8-14). Gebhardt's forward extending hosel differs from the present invention because 1) Gebhardt has no rearward hosel extension (which is not part of the functional hosel) to extend the sight line; 2) the hosel length exceeds the 5 inches from shaft connection point through hosel to clubhead sole plane allowed under the USGA Rules of Golf and the 1/4 to 1 ball diameter forward of the strikeface of the present invention; 3) the forward extending hosel section bends 90° to the shaft connecting section before reaching said shaft connection, thus interrupting (Claim 3) and shortening the sight line on said forward hosel section (compare Gebhardt Fig. 9 vs 4 and 6 of present invention); 4) Gebhardt's hosel is circular in section without the more visible flat sight line in preferred embodiments of the present invention; and 5) Gebhardt is not "faced balanced" per Claim 3 of the present invention.

Applicant acknowledges Szokola discloses a hosel extending forward 1/2 ball diameter in front of a putterface, but Szokola:

- 1) lacks the “rearward hosel extension” of the present invention for extending the sight line (which is not part of the functional hosel);
- 2) does not have the hosel and shaft axis in differing planes like the present invention;
- 3) like Gebhardt, Szokola violates the USGA Rules of Golf with a shaft connection to sole plane length exceeding 5 inches;
- 4) violates the USGA Rules of Golf in Figs. 1-4 and 6 with a 0° shaft axis to vertical plane angle (vs. min. 10° required); only Fig. 5 (dotted line) may conform, but here the hosel plane is not vertical per the present invention;
- 5) in all embodiments, Szokola only discloses and claims a “rearwall” hosel “mounting” location vs the top or front (putterface) hosel to putterhead connection of the present invention;
- 6) Szokola only discloses and claims an “arcuate” hosel shape of circular section vs the non-arcuate hosel shape of the present invention with preferably a flat top (for sight line visibility) or square or rectangular section (see Figs. 4-6); and
- 7) Szokola, like Gebhardt, but unlike the present invention, shows an arcuate 90° bend between the forward hosel section and the shaft connection point which shortens and “interrupts” any “sight line” (which Szokola neither describes or claims); Szokola’s sight line is further blocked and shortened by having his shaft axis co-incident with his hosel axis.

11. Claim 3 Rejection - 35 USC 103(a) over Gebhardt, Szokola and Meyer

Applicant acknowledges that Meyer ‘883 (and other prior art) discloses a face balanced putter. Neither Meyer, Gebhardt or Szokola, however, combines a USGA legal, uninterrupted, vertical plane, forward extending hosel with a (non-hosel) rearward hosel extension per the present invention. Applicant also maintains that this Claim 3 rejection is transversed for the 5 Gebhardt differences and 7 Szokola differences vs the present invention described in section 9 & 10 above.

12. Claim 4 Rejection - 35 USC 103(a) Gebhardt/Szokola and Pollman

Claim 4 is dependent upon Claim 1 which transcends Gebhardt and Szokola for the reasons described in 9 & 10 above. Gebhardt in view of Szokola does not describe the forward extending hosel and rearward hosel extension of the present invention for the reasons previously cited or combine it with a “rearward hosel extension.” Pollman’s

sight line is not a hosel extension. Pollman's hosel is behind the faceplate not in front of the putterface.

13. Claim 5 Rejection - 35 USC 103(a) over Gebhardt/Szokola/Pollman/Klein

Claim 5 depends on Claim 4 which depends on Claim 1 which transcends Gebhardt and Szokola for the reasons previously described. Neither Klein nor any cited prior art describes a white or light top surface to any portion of a hosel lying above the golf ball in front of the intended strike point.

14. Claim 6 Rejection - 35 USC 103(a) over Gebhardt/Szokola/Pollman/Klein and Radakovich

Claim 6 (as amended) is dependent on Claim 1 which rejection over Gebhardt and Szokola for the 5 and 7 reasons respectively is transversed as previously described herein. Radakovich describes a shaded shaft, but does not have a forward extending hosel and rearward hosel extension of the present invention, partially shaded or otherwise.

15. Claim 7 Rejection - 35 USC 103(a) over Gebhardt/Szokola/Byrne

Claim 7 is dependent on Claims 1 and 2 which rejection over Gebhardt and Szokola is transversed as previously described herein. Byrne does not use his aim line mark in conjunction with the forward extending hosel and rearward hosel extension of the subject invention.

16. Claim 8 Rejection - 35 USC 103(a) over Gebhardt/Szokola/and Sasse

Claim 8 is dependent on Claims 1 and 2 which rejection over Gebhardt and Szokola is transversed as previously described herein. Sasse does not use his aim line in conjunction with the forward extending hosel and rearward hosel extension of the present invention. Sasse uses a thin section, but does not use holes, apertures, lightweight materials (i.e., composites) or combinations thereof.

17. Amendments Conclusion

Claim 11 is added as described in the Specification and Figure 6 (element 18). Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration in view of the amended Claims and Remarks herein.

Conclusion

In view of the above amended Claims and Remarks, it is submitted that the Claims are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the objections and rejections is requested. Allowance of amended Claims 1-11 is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "John W. Rohrer", written in a cursive style.

John W. Rohrer

Rohrer Technologies, Inc.
5 Long Cove Road
York, ME 03909
(207) 363-5502